	L5HVDONF			
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,			
4	v. 19 CR 561 (LAP)			
5	11 CV 691 (LAK) STEVEN DONZIGER,			
6	Defendant. BENCH TRIAL			
7	x			
8	New York, N.Y. May 17, 2021			
9	9:38 a.m.			
10	Before:			
11	HON. LORETTA A. PRESKA,			
12	District Judge			
14	APPEARANCES			
15	RITA M. GLAVIN			
16	SAREEN K. ARMANI BRIAN P. MALONEY			
17	Special Assistant United States Attorneys LAW OFFICE OF RONALD L. KUBY Attorneys for Defendant			
18				
19	BY: RONALD L. KUBY RHIDAYA S. TRIVEDI			
20	-AND- OFFIT KURMAN PA			
21	BY: MARTIN GARBUS			
22	ALSO PRESENT: GRACE GILL, Paralegal			
23				
24				
25				

(In open court; trial resumed)

THE COURT: I have Mr. Garbus on my agenda, but we can do him whenever you want.

What is on your agenda, Mr. Kuby?

MR. KUBY: Well, I would like Mr. Garbus to proceed first, if we can do him whenever he wants.

On my agenda I have some discussions brief -- some brief discussions about the state of the record. And I believe Ms. Glavin and I are going to discuss those together, with the permission of the Court, or she's going to say things and I'm going to agree, something like that.

THE COURT: I always like that.

MR. KUBY: Right?

I do want to address the issue briefly of how we deal with Mr. Brodsky's letter regarding Mr. Thomson's -- what I will call in quotes "false testimony," as in the opposite of true, like the bar exam true/false kind of thing.

And at that point I'm thinking that the prosecution rests. Then it is Mr. Donziger's intention to not exercise his right to testify. He has a brief statement he'd like to make about that and, you know, allocute him or not after listening to him for less than a minute, as the Court chooses.

Thereupon, the defense intends to rest.

There are some outstanding motions that will either be withdrawn or asked for a ruling upon. And if all goes well and

we don't exhaust your supply of goodwill, we should be done by about 10:30-ish, unless the Court has other plans. I know that you and I spent Saturday night seeing who could stay up the latest. You won.

THE COURT: Ha.

MR. KUBY: Ha. And I think we're done.

THE COURT: All right. Cool.

Would you folks like to talk about the state of the record first? And I will say for the record that, of course, I received Mr. Brodsky's letter dated May 14 and have it. And also for the record, I received Mr. Brodsky's sealed filing dated May 11, relating to hours billed and fees billed by Gibson Crutcher to Chevron for certain time periods in 2019 through 2021. Obviously I have taken that into account and will take it into account, along with Mr. Brodsky's May 14 letter, in determining any bias on the part of the Gibson Dunn witnesses.

MR. KUBY: I take it, Judge, you're disinclined to remove your seal from those records?

THE COURT: Yes, sir, on the ground that the amounts billed for hours billed relating to Chevron is confidential law firm information.

So state of the record, please, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. KUBY: Brian gets to speak. Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Maloney.

I₂5HVDONF

MR. MALONEY: Good morning, your Honor.

So we've reviewed the transcript, and we identified a handful of exhibits in which the transcript does not indicate that they were received into evidence. And so we conferred with Mr. Kuby over the weekend, and we would move to admit the following exhibits into evidence:

Government Exhibit 1, Government Exhibit 1A,

Government Exhibit 201, Government Exhibit 601, Government

Exhibit 2105, Government Exhibit 6, Government Exhibit 7,

Government Exhibit 126, Government Exhibit 301, Government

Exhibit 1986-1, Government Exhibit 2104-1, and Government

Exhibit 2108.

In addition, we conferred with Mr. Kuby about

Government Exhibit 118, which was a document production made by
the defendant, and a confidentiality concern was raised as to
certain amounts in accounts on that document. So we've
prepared a redacted version of that exhibit and we would
propose to admit the redacted version into evidence.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Any objection?

MR. KUBY: None, Judge.

THE COURT: All are admitted.

(Government's Exhibits 1, 1A, 6, 7, 118, 126, 201,

301, 601, 1986-1, 2104-1, 2105, and 2108 received in evidence)

MR. MALONEY: One final clarification.

1 THE COURT: Excuse me. I'm sorry. Off the record. (Off record) 2 3 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I thought Mr. Kuby had a 4 remark. 5 MR. KUBY: No, no. I've got some, but not with 6 respect to this. 7 MR. MALONEY: Last clarification, your Honor. On the May 12th transcript, Defense Exhibit DD, which was admitted for 8 9 a limited purpose, was incorrectly identified as Government 10 Exhibit 2081. And we just note that clarification, that that document is Defense Exhibit DD. 11 12 THE COURT: DD is Government Exhibit what? 13 MR. MALONEY: Government Exhibit 2081 identified on 14 the May 12th transcript is actually Defense Exhibit DD. So 15 that document should be identified as Defense Exhibit DD on the That was received only for the fact that it was said 16 17 and not for the truth. 18 THE COURT: Thank you. 19 Is that okay with you, Mr. Kuby? 20 MR. KUBY: Yes, that's all fine, Judge. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. 22 (Defendant's Exhibit DD received in evidence) 23 MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, there was one other defense 24 exhibit, I-51. This was the chart that was prepared, the table 25 of meetings in person and videoconferences between the four

Gibson Dunn subpoenaed witnesses and the special prosecutors.

We redacted that pursuant to the agreement between special prosecutors and the defense. The title at the top refers to "Log of In-person Meetings and Videoconferences Between Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher -- "

THE COURT: Slowly.

MS. GLAVIN: Sorry. "Between Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher and the Special Prosecutors." The title really should be "Log of In-person Meetings and Videoconferences Between Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher Partners Subpoenaed by the Defense and the Special Prosecutors in *United States v. Donziger*."

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KUBY: I'm sorry, there's a comma issue, I think. Gibson Dunn partners who testified at trial that were subpoenaed.

MS. GLAVIN: Oh, yes.

MR. KUBY: It was subpoenaed. It makes it sound like we subpoenaed witnesses, which we so didn't do. So with that clarification of the clarification, I think we're clear.

THE COURT: Okay. Wonderful.

Okay. Is that it for the state of the record?

MR. KUBY: No. We have the issue of Mr. Thomson's — and having said "false" once, I will simply say incorrect statement as to who was paying which bill. And I completely accept Mr. Brodsky's unsworn statement that it was inadvertent.

I think as we've all --

THE COURT: I think there was a sworn affidavit that went with that, right?

MR. KUBY: Right, right, right. I'm getting there. I'm just on the letter now.

I fully accept his explanation that it was completely inadvertent on Mr. Thomson's part. Obviously been so much money passed back and forth between Chevron and GDC, it's hard to tell who picked up which bill ultimately. I get that. But now what we have in inadmissible form --

THE COURT: Excuse me.

Mr. Garbus.

MR. GARBUS: Yes.

THE COURT: While age was good for both of us in getting us vaccinated, it does not give you a pass on wearing your mask. This is at least the 48,000th time I've said of that.

MR. GARBUS: I don't think so.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GARBUS: About the seventh time.

THE COURT: Mr. Kuby.

MR. KUBY: What we now have in inadmissible form that is not subject to cross-examination is extrinsic evidence that Mr. Thomson's statement was incorrect, which is also technically inadmissible. And I suppose we could just ignore

it, but that would leave Mr. Thomson's incorrect testimony on the record.

So this is what I would propose: I think by now this Court either understands that Chevron has used GDC as a buffer, insulating it from its efforts to pursue Mr. Donziger criminally, or this Court not understand that. This Court either finds as relevant or this Court does not.

I don't think Mr. Brodsky's submission and the Mowen affidavit will have any effect on the Court's decision; and I see no useful purpose in dragging either Ms. Mowen up from Dallas or poor Mr. Thomson back from L.A., burning more fossil fuels, for absolutely no purpose.

So I would be prepared to stipulate for the record that when Mr. Thomson answered the series of questions as to who was paying for his flights, the answer is Gibson Dunn Crutcher, not Chevron. And that way Mr. Thomson's incorrect testimony doesn't linger on the record to haunt him in his career and the record is clear.

MS. GLAVIN: Fine with the special prosecutors, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well, sir.

MR. KUBY: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All righty.

Are we ready to go to Mr. -- I had understood the prosecution to have rested Friday with the caveat that they

```
might look at some exhibits, which, of course, we finished.
1
 2
               So I think the prosecution has rested.
 3
               MS. GLAVIN: Yes, your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. Are we ready to go to Mr. Donziger?
 5
                          I'm ready to go to Mr. Garbus, but if
               MR. KUBY:
      you're ready to go to Mr. Donziger --
6
 7
               THE COURT: Why don't we do the trial stuff first.
               MR. KUBY: Okay.
 8
9
               THE COURT: All right.
10
               Mr. Donziger, would you maybe go in the booth so that
11
      you can be heard.
12
               Now, Mr. Donziger, you understand that you have the
13
      constitutional right to testify on your own behalf at this
14
      criminal trial; correct, sir?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: I do, Judge.
16
               THE COURT: And you also understand that your decision
17
      whether or not to testify is yours, and yours alone? While
18
      counsel has an obligation to advise you about the benefits and
19
      the hazards of testifying or not testifying, the decision to do
20
      so is yours, and yours alone. Do you understand that, sir?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
22
               I just want to clarify --
23
               THE COURT: And do you also understand that should you
24
      choose not to testify, no adverse inference may be drawn
25
      against you on account of that decision?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: I do understand that.
1
 2
               I just want to --
 3
               THE COURT: And sir, in light of those facts, am I
 4
      correct that it is your intention to waive your right to
 5
      testify on your own behalf?
6
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. I think we're finished.
               THE DEFENDANT: No, I think I'd like to read a
8
9
      statement.
10
               THE COURT: No, you don't get to read a statement,
11
      sir. You either take the stand or you sit down.
12
               MR. KUBY: Judge, I would request that Mr. Donziger be
13
      offered, if not the right, at least the courtesy of explaining
14
      his decision to not testify to the Court.
15
               THE COURT: Nope. This is not a press conference.
               You either testify or you don't.
16
17
               MR. KUBY: It's not -- Judge, sometimes statements are
18
     dual use. The press may be interested in them --
               THE COURT: Well, then Mr. Donziger is more than
19
20
      invited to go outside and have a press conference, but not
21
      here.
22
               MR. KUBY: Okay. But just because the press is
23
      interested in something, it doesn't mean it's irrelevant in
24
      this courtroom, at least from my perception. So I would ask he
25
      be given 30 seconds, 30 seconds --
```

```
THE COURT: No.
1
 2
               MR. KUBY: -- to say what he wants to say.
               THE COURT: The issues on trial here were as to the
 3
      issuance of an order to Mr. Donziger, Mr. Donziger's
 4
 5
      disobedience or disregard of the order, and Mr. Donziger's
6
      knowledge or willfulness in disobeying the order. None of that
 7
      is subject to unsworn testimony.
               MR. KUBY: This is not unsworn testimony.
8
9
               THE COURT: Yeah, it is. He's not being sworn in.
10
               MR. KUBY:
                          This is not testimony, hence it's --
               THE COURT: It's an unsworn statement. It will not be
11
12
     permitted. Mr. Donziger is more than invited to the witness
13
              If he doesn't go to the witness stand and give sworn
      stand.
14
      testimony, then he may not speak.
15
               MR. KUBY: I understand the Court's ruling.
     Mr. Donziger, of course, will abide by it.
16
17
               Again, I do think that given everything, 30 seconds of
      listening to Mr. Donziger should be permitted in this Court.
18
      respect the fact the Court has said no now, I think, three
19
20
              So I'm not going to push for a fourth.
21
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
22
               Are we up to Mr. Garbus?
23
               MR. KUBY: Unless I'm misunderstanding -- unless I'm
24
     misunderstanding trial proceedings, which I may well be doing,
25
      because it's been a while since I've had a trial -- ooh, that
```

25

```
rhymes -- the defense rests.
1
 2
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
 3
               And I take it there is no rebuttal case.
 4
               MS. GLAVIN: No, your Honor.
                           Thank you.
 5
               THE COURT:
 6
               Mr. Garbus, with respect to your motion, sir, can I
 7
      just say, you had asserted in your original motion that: "On
      Friday, May 7, 2021, the U.S. Department of Justice notified
8
9
     Mr. Donziger that it was declining his request from over a
10
     month earlier to exercise supervision over this prosecution in
      the name of and by the authority of the United States."
11
12
               You maintained that: "In the extraordinary context of
13
      this case, this lack of supervision appears to present a severe
14
      constitutional defect that renders the actions of the private
15
     prosecutors unconstitutional and void."
               In response, sir, I asked you on several occasions to
16
17
      file on the public docket the document that you received from
18
      the Department of Justice. And you finally did that by filing
      your declaration, along with an appendix containing the
19
20
      communication from the Department of Justice. You "urged the
21
      Court to address the pending motion to dismiss as a matter of
22
     priority."
23
               I've reviewed those findings and, as you know, asked
```

I've reviewed those findings and, as you know, asked you to put the letter on.

First, the communication that you reference is not a

formal memorandum or even a letter from the Department of

Justice; it's an email message that appears to be from Mr. John

P. Carlin, whom the Court understands to be the current acting

deputy attorney general. But the message wasn't sent to you;

it was sent to a Mr. William Taylor, who then forwarded it to

Mr. Donziger. So in my view, this is a double hearsay problem.

So I'd like to hear from you about all of the above,

So I'd like to hear from you about all of the above, sir.

MR. GARBUS: Thank you very much.

This is not an Article 29 motion, we should be clear, it's a motion --

THE COURT: Sir, into the microphone, please, so you can be heard.

MR. GARBUS: We should just be clear, this is not an Article 29 motion, this is an argument with respect to the open issue.

After we left court, we did three things fundamentally at your request to try and get further information about this prosecution and about the things that are referred to in the Carlin letter. I clarified the next day — after you quoted exactly what was in that letter, you've omitted my clarification.

Let me just tell you what we have done in respect to your request. We have contacted Mr. Berman's office. We have written to DOJ in Washington --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: Counsel, counsel, it doesn't matter what
you have done. What matters is what was the result.
                                                     And the
reason I deferred consideration of your motion is that we did
not have any direct admissible evidence of a policy or a
decision by the DOJ. So far as I can see, we are still in that
situation, because all we have is this double hearsay email.
        MR. GARBUS: May I continue?
         THE COURT: No. Answer my question. It doesn't
matter --
         (Indiscernible crosstalk)
         THE COURT: Sir, are you interrupting me now?
        MR. GARBUS: Go ahead, Judge.
        THE COURT: It doesn't matter what steps you have
taken; it matters what the result is and what formal
communication you have from the DOJ.
        Please tell me what that is.
        MR. GARBUS: That letter is the entire communication.
        THE COURT: The email, sir? The email, sir?
        MR. GARBUS: Yes.
        THE COURT: All right.
        How can I admit that, how can I consider that, given
that it's double hearsay?
        MR. GARBUS: We have tried since then to get testimony
from the Department of Justice. We have tried to get testimony
```

from the U.S. Attorney's Office to deal with that very letter.

And that was the function of this motion.

What we had done since we got that letter is all we could do. We made a number of constitutional arguments. You indicated repeatedly that we did not have the facts to support those arguments. We then made every attempt we could, and we will exchange and hand up today documentation from the U.S. Attorney's Office. I called Mr. Berman —

THE COURT: Counsel, may I just interrupt?

Your representation in your motion was that the U.S. Department of Justice was declining Mr. Donziger's request to exercise supervision over this prosecution. So I'm not sure how the United States Attorney in this district is going to give you any information that is cognizable or the former United States Attorney in this district. The question is what do you have from DOJ Main Justice?

MR. GARBUS: I have from DOJ whatever I've told you we have. We recognized that we needed more, and we went to the U.S. Attorney in this district --

THE COURT: Okay. Hand up what you have, sir. It would have been useful had I had it to review in advance, but since I didn't, let's take a look.

MR. GARBUS: Judge, you set this for argument now, and this is the appropriate time to hand it up.

THE COURT: Okay. As long as you don't want me to have read it beforehand, sure.

MR. GARBUS: I did not do that because I did not want 1 you to read it beforehand. 2 3 THE COURT: It might be better, Mr. Garbus, if you 4 would adjust your tone of voice a little bit. 5 MR. GARBUS: It might be better if you treated me 6 very, very differently. 7 THE COURT: Thank you for that, sir. MR. GARBUS: You will see from the letter --8 9 THE COURT: I haven't read it yet. I'm sorry, this is 10 a --11 MR. GARBUS: Can I make some preliminary remarks about 12 the letter? 13 THE COURT: -- three-page single spaced letter dated 14 May 12. I note that today is May 17. And that's from Zachary 15 Bannon, Assistant United States Attorney in the Southern District of New York. 16 17 You've also handed up a little over a one-page letter 18 also dated May 12 to Mr. Bannon from you. 19 Do you want me to read them or not? 20 MR. GARBUS: No, I'd rather argue first and discuss it 21 with you before we get into it so I can explain it and there is 22 no claim that anything has been misexplained to you. 23 May I speak? 24 THE COURT: Let me read it first. 25 (Pause)

MR. GARBUS: I would just like to say one thing, even as you're reading the letter. Ms. Glavin said in court she had no supervision, that --

THE COURT: Counsel, let me read the letter please.

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. To the extent I can discern after a quick read, it appears that your letter, Mr. Garbus, was essentially a request for discovery on various topics from the United States Attorney's office.

And it appears, in addition, that Mr. Bannon's response was mostly a denial of the request, but, in addition, a notification that to the extent the request looked for information bearing on the credibility or bias of witnesses who might testify, the request was premature, and because impeachment evidence becomes relevant only after a witness takes the stand.

So with respect to that request number two, Mr. Bannon requested that Mr. Donziger resubmit any *Touhy* request seeking impeachment information about potential witnesses at the time the witnesses testify.

So that's all we have. This is all about discovery.

MR. GARBUS: No, it's not. What it is, is about

Mr. Bannon's interpretation of your rulings, which preclude him

from giving me information. So that if you --

THE COURT: Counsel, can I just ask you something?

MR. GARBUS: Yes.

THE COURT: I don't understand how requests for discovery from the government rise to the level of constituting some kind of constitutional impediment here. I understood your original motion to be arguing that to the extent the Department of Justice said that it was not planing and would not exercise any supervisory authority over the prosecution in this case, that it might present a problem. Turns out that's not what it said.

To the extent that there is something somewhere that says that, tell me now. A request for discovery is no substitute for that.

MR. GARBUS: We made that request for discovery. And if you look at Mr. Bannon's letter, you will see at page 3 how he interprets your ruling.

May I present an argument at least somewhat coherently so that many of these things can be explained and you will take whatever exception you want to it? It's impossible to do it in this incoherent way.

THE COURT: What's that sign behind you? Would you mind turning it over? Is that your notes or what is that?

MR. GARBUS: I was going to show it to you.

THE COURT: I can see it. Why don't you argue.

And that's exactly my point, sir. To the extent that the DOJ has said that this prosecutor is wholly unsupervised,

that they will take no action and they say they have no action, that's one thing. But that's not what any of these documents says.

MR. GARBUS: The way to find out the further information is to get information from the U.S. Attorney's Office and DOJ, and we have tried to do that.

THE COURT: But we don't have it.

MR. GARBUS: Pardon me?

THE COURT: But we don't have it, so that's where we are.

MR. GARBUS: We made a motion for discovery early on.

THE COURT: It was already denied more than once.

MR. GARBUS: And it was denied on May 6. And then Mr. Bannon refers to that decision as a reason for denying us information. So it is your decision basically that informs DOJ -- pardon me, that informs Bannon as to what information he can and cannot give us. What he could give us free of any statements from you is unknown. And we seek to get the discovery to show you that everything we said in our oral argument to start this, namely --

THE COURT: The requests for discovery which you rely on and which Mr. Bannon references were denied because the defense had not made an adequate showing of its entitlement to this discovery.

MR. GARBUS: Yes. And we had --

THE COURT: I adhere to that ruling.

MR. GARBUS: Yes. And once you made that determination, that we did not have the sufficient facts because they are locked up in the government, we can't get them, we then went to the government to every extent that we could. We went to DOJ. I called Mr. Berman, asked him to testify. Mr. Bannon then comes in, as is appropriate, and we then exchange in correspondence.

There is no reason why Mr. Berman is not in court testifying other than the government refusing to allow us to get information about not just the question of the sole discretion, but also what is a disinterested prosecutor, what are the tests? What test was made of Seward & Kissel to determine that they were disinterested?

THE COURT: Mr. Garbus, you have the -- the defense has asked for this discovery more than once. I have denied it more than once as not being a proper request. To the extent that you are asking for reconsideration now, reconsideration is denied because you have not proffered any fact or law which the Court overlooked.

There is no point in going on about the discovery, sir. Your moving papers have given the Court absolutely no basis on which to conclude that the special prosecutors are not subject to any control or supervision whatsoever by the Executive Branch.

25

Accordingly, the motion is denied. 1 MR. GARBUS: I find your lack of curiosity as to what 2 3 motivates this prosecution --4 THE COURT: Counsel, the Court's curiosity is not a 5 test here. The motion is denied. 6 Mr. Kuby, is there anything else we have to do, 7 I think we need to talk about a briefing schedule, 8 counsel. Have you folks had the opportunity to confer? 9 MR. KUBY: We have. 10 THE COURT: What's your plan? 11 MR. KUBY: We would suggest 30 days simultaneous 12 briefing. But we recognize that the Court has made -- well, I 13 recognize the Court has its own sense of what this trial is 14 about. That sense will govern, and the Court may not need to give us 30 days. We don't know. But in an earlier, younger, 15 more innocent time, that's what Ms. Glavin and I agreed to. 16 17 THE COURT: Would you talk to each other and let me 18 know if you can do it in two weeks. And it's only because I 19 don't -- I want to have it fresh in my mind. 20 MR. KUBY: Yes. Could I just speak to the human who's 21 actually going to write it? 22 THE COURT: Of course. 23 MR. KUBY: Thank you.

MR. KUBY: Yes, two weeks is fine, Judge.

(Counsel conferred)

```
1
               THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
               MS. TRIVEDI: Yes, your Honor, it's fine.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Is there anything else, friends?
 4
               MR. KUBY: Only this, Judge: The time the Court takes
5
      to render a verdict is very much the Court's time to take. I
6
      don't know if you want to set a date now.
 7
               THE COURT: I'm not going to be able to set a date
      now. I assure you, every effort will be made to do this as
8
9
      quickly as possible.
10
               MR. KUBY: I will defer to that, Judge.
11
               I just want to put my schedule on the record.
12
               I promised my incredibly long suffering wife of 35
13
      years, you can only imagine what it's been for her, vacation
14
      from June 30th through July 20th. And I will be out of the
15
      country. We have another vacation planned, which is in New
      Jersey on the Jersey Shore, so I can return from that from the
16
17
      31st of July, which is both Mr. Donziger's contempt anniversary
      and my birthday, through Labor Day. But if the Court sets an
18
19
      August date, I'm happy to -- well, "happy" is the wrong word --
20
               THE COURT: All right.
21
               We'll worry about that, but thank you for letting me
22
     know.
23
               MR. KUBY:
                          Okay. Thank you, Judge.
24
               THE COURT: Is there anything else?
```

MR. KUBY: Yes, I think there are still two

25

outstanding motions. 1 2 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 3 MR. KUBY: And I could be wrong. One is a motion for Mr. Donziger to have hybrid 4 5 representation. Given everything, I will withdraw that motion 6 as moot. 7 THE COURT: Yes, sir. MR. KUBY: And there's still an outstanding motion 8 9 with respect to Ms. Glavin's emails with Judge --10 communications in any form, insert all the definitions here, 11 exchanges with Judge Kaplan with respect to the Donziger case, 12 and a request for yours as well. That has not been ruled upon. 13 I had requested that they be assembled, placed under seal, and 14 transmitted to the Second Circuit at the appropriate time. THE COURT: Ms. Glavin, do you want to be heard on 15 16 that? 17 MS. GLAVIN: No more than I already have been heard on the issue. 18 THE COURT: I adhere to my prior rulings that that 19 20 material is not properly the subject of discovery and, 21 accordingly, deny this request. 22 MR. KUBY: I'm not quarreling with the judge's ruling. 23 We are not seeking --24 THE COURT: I understand. I understand.

For the reasons cited --

L5HVDONF 1 MR. KUBY: I see. 2 THE COURT: -- in the prior requests for that 3 discovery, the new motion to have it assembled and sealed is also denied. 4 5 MR. KUBY: Thank you, Judge. 6 THE COURT: Anything else, sir? 7 MR. KUBY: I think not. 8 THE COURT: All righty. 9 Anything else from the prosecution? 10 MS. GLAVIN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. Nice to see you all. 11 12 MR. KUBY: Nice to see you too, Judge. 13 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 14 Reserve. 15 (Trial concluded) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

	L5HVDONF	. age 20 of 20	
1	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS		
2	Exhibit No.	Received	
3	1, 1A, 6, 7, 118, 126, 201, 301, 601,	. 842	
4	1986-1, 2104-1, 2105, and 2108		
5	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS		
6	Exhibit No.	Received	
7	DD	. 843	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			